

REMARKS

The following Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed December 19, 2007. Claims 1, 4, 8-9, and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application. Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful review of the present application.

Claim Objections

I. Claims 4 and 9 were objected to because of the following informalities: "Excel" is a trademark and should be capitalized. Appropriate correction is required.

In response, applicant has amended claims 4 and 9 respectively by capitalizing the trademark "Excel" to "EXCEL" in the corresponding lines. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections of claims 4 and 9 are requested.

II. Claims 8 and 16 were objected to because of the following informalities: "does not matches" should be "does not match". Appropriate correction is required.

In response, applicant has amended claims 8 and 16 respectively by changing the phrase "does not matches" to the phrase "does not match" in the corresponding lines. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections of claims 8 and 16 are requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

I. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. (US Pat No. 5,315,505, hereinafter referred to as "Pratt") in view of Applicant admission of prior art (hereinafter referred to as "AAP"), and further in view of Polk (US Pat No. 7,072,909).

II. Claims 2, 4, 9, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt in view of AAP, in view of Polk, and further in view of Official Notice.

In response, applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 16. With this amendment Applicant has further limit claims 1, 8, and 16. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification, for example see paragraph [0022], as originally filed. Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-16. The following remarks are responsive to the rejections:

Claims 1-7

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

‘a data transmission module for *converting the demanded data on auditing into an electronic auditing file according to a format of EDI reporting required by a relevant customs authority*, and for transmitting the electronic auditing file to the customs system’.

Applicant submits that none of Pratt, AAP, Polk, or their combination, teaches or otherwise suggests the invention having the above-highlighted feature as set forth in amended claim 1.

On page 4 of the Office action, it is stated that Pratt and AAP do not teach the feature of “*converting the demanded data on auditing into an electronic auditing file according to a format of EDI reporting required by a relevant customs authority*”. That is, none of Pratt, AAP, and their combination, teaches or otherwise suggests the invention having the above-highlighted feature as set forth in claim 1.

It is also stated that Polk teaches the feature of “*converting the demanded data on auditing into an electronic auditing file according to a format of EDI reporting required by a relevant customs authority*.” However, applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses as follows:

Polk teaches that EDI allows for accumulation processing, transmittal, and receipt of business-related information that was once dependent on paper transactions. Polk further teaches that the EDI transaction sets for exchange of business information pertaining to ocean, motor, air, and rail carriers and the associated shippers, brokers, customs, freight forwards, and bankers (column 1, lines 42-62). Applicant acknowledges that the EDI transaction can be used for transmitting the business information on customs. That is, the claimed “transmitting the electronic auditing file with a format of EDI to the customs system” of claim 1 is taught or suggested by Polk. Although Polk teaches the means of “EDI transaction”, there are no disclosures or suggestions in Polk regarding the feature of “converting the demanded data *on auditing into an electronic auditing file* according to a format of EDI reporting required by a relevant customs authority”, as recited in claim 1 of the present application. In particular, the claimed “data transmission module” of claim 1 is not taught or suggested at all by Polk. That is, there is no disclosure or suggestion about **how** to convert data on auditing into a required EDI format file (i.e., an electronic auditing file with the EDI format).

However, the presently claimed “data transmission module” in amended claim 1 *can convert the demanded data on auditing into an electronic auditing file according to a format of EDI reporting required by a relevant customs authority*. This feature is supported by paragraph [0021] of the originally filed specification, and is not mentioned or suggested in the use of EDI taught by Polk.

Accordingly, applicant submits that Polk fails to teach or suggest the feature of “*a data transmission module for converting the demanded data on auditing into an electronic auditing file according to a format of EDI reporting required by a relevant customs authority*”, as recited in claim 1 of the present application. In addition, applicant submits that any combination of Pratt, AAP and Polk does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted feature either.

In addition, claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

‘a return receipt identification module for downloading a return receipt from the customs system, for ***determining whether a declaration is acceptable based on the return receipt***, for determining whether information on book inventory matches information on physical inventory, and for providing an explanation report on balancing of book inventory and physical inventory’.

Applicant submits that none of Pratt, AAP, Polk, or their combination, teaches or otherwise suggests the invention having the above-highlighted feature as set forth in amended claim 1.

On page 4 of the Office action, Examiner stated that Pratt does not teach or suggest the feature of determining whether a declaration is acceptable, but AAP teaches determining whether a declaration is acceptable (paragraph [0004]). Applicant submits that which prior art is the applicant admitted prior art (AAP) stated by Examiner , and there is no teaching or suggestion in relation to the above-highlighted feature in paragraph [0004] in “Background of the Invention” or “Information Disclosure Sheet” of the present application as originally filed. Applicant states that the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination including the claimed feature of ***“determining whether a declaration is acceptable based on the return receipt”*** must be found in the prior art and not based on applicant’s disclosure. Furthermore, Polk does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted feature either. Accordingly, applicant submits that any combination of Pratt, AAP, and Polk does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted feature.

In conclusion, applicant submits that none of Pratt, AAP, and Polk, or their combination, teaches or otherwise suggests the invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in amended claim 1. That is, amended claim 1 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Pratt in view of AAP, and further in view of Polk.

Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 are requested.

Since claims 2-7 depend directly from amended independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter, claims 2-7 should also be allowable.

If further argument is needed in relation to claim 2, Applicant respectfully traverses the content and/or the utilization of the Official Notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the invention of claim 1 to include settings serial numbers of electronic account books as stated on page 9 of the Office action. Pratt teaches a method for setting account days or years (column 7, lines 12-33). Further, Polk teaches a method for exchanging business information on customs. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Pratt's and Polk's method (nor in any of the other cited references) in relation to the feature of "setting serial numbers of electronic account books, account years, cut-off times, starting times, names and states of the auditing periods," as recited in claim 2 of the present application. However, applicant submits that the Official Notice is very general, and cannot properly be relied on to overcome the shortfalls in the teachings of Pratt and Polk. That is, Pratt and Polk do not contain any teaching or suggestion which might lead one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the above-highlighted feature as set forth in claim 2, even in view of the Official Notice.

Claims 8-15

Claim 8, as amended, recites in part:

*'converting the demanded data on auditing into an electronic auditing file according to a format of EDI reporting required by a relevant customs authority, and transmitting the electronic auditing file;
downloading a return receipt; [and]
determining whether a declaration is acceptable based on the return receipt'.*

Amended claim 8 is a method claim corresponding to the periodical auditing system of claim 1. Referring to and incorporating herein the above-asserted reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 1, applicant submits that none of Pratt, AAP, and Polk, or their combination, teaches or otherwise suggests the invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in amended claim 8. Accordingly, amended claim 8 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Pratt in view of AAP, and further in view of Polk. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 8 are requested.

Since claims 9-15 depend directly from independent claim 8, and respectively recite additional subject matter, claims 9-15 should also be allowable.

Claim 16

Claim 16, as amended, recites in part:

*‘converting the demanded data on auditing into an electronic auditing file according to a format of EDI reporting required by a relevant customs authority, and transmitting the electronic auditing file;
downloading a return receipt; [and]
determining whether a declaration is acceptable based on the return receipt’.*

For at least reasons similar and corresponding to those asserted above in relation to amended claims 1 and 8, applicant submits that none of Pratt, AAP, and Polk, or their combination, teaches or otherwise suggests the invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in amended claim 16. Accordingly, amended claim 16 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Pratt in view of AAP, and further in view of Polk. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 16 are requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully,
Fenghua Zhou

By / Frank R. Niranjana / Dated: March 11, 2008

Frank R. Niranjana

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649